

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/581,264	Applicant(s) DE ANGELIS	
	Examiner LaToya I. Cross	Art Unit 1743	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) LaToya I. Cross. (3)_____.

(2) Todd Baker. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 05 August 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 3.

Identification of prior art discussed: Williams et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Att. Baker addressed the concern of the instant invention requiring the presence of a membrane permeable to gases and impermeable to water. Williams et al teaches a cap having slots to allow gases to be tested to enter the housing and contact a sensor therein. Williams et al does not explicitly teach that the cap is impermeable to water, however, it is the position of the Examiner that such would be inherent because should water contact the sample, then the sensor would no longer be functional. It was suggested that the particular membrane material (specifically ePFTE) be incorporated into claim 3. Neither Williams et al nor Loesch teach ePFTE membranes. Should such an amendment be submitted, the rejection will be overcome and withdrawn by the Examiner. Should Applicant submit an RCE incorporating the limitations of claim 4 into claim 3, the Examiner will reconsider the rejection over Williams et al in view of Loesch.